

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 91, 92, 95, 96 and 99-102 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner states that Claims 91 and 92 recite “a second insulating film over said semiconductor layer, the source region, the drain region and the second wiring, wherein the second insulating film is in contact with the channel formation region” and that this is possibly unclear. The Examiner contends that the term “over” could be taken to mean “on a layer higher than but not necessarily overlapping” or “on a layer higher than and overlapping at least partially.” The Examiner selected the latter interpretation for examining purposes and requests confirmation from Applicants.

The Examiner is correct. The later interpretation (i.e. “on a layer higher than and overlapping at least partially”) is the correct interpretation.

Therefore, Applicants have complied with the Examiner’s request, and the claims are not indefinite. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112, First Paragraph

The Examiner also rejects Claims 91, 92, 95, 96 and 99-102 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed features of independent Claims 91 and 92 are described in Embodiments 7 and 8 and Figs. 15 and 16 of the present application. For example, Fig. 16 illustrates the claimed feature of a second insulating film over the semiconductor layer, the source region, the drain region and the second wiring, wherein the

second insulating film is in contact with the channel formation region. Fig. 15 illustrates the claimed feature of a source wiring formed over said first substrate, the source wiring electrically connected to said source region through a second wiring, wherein said first insulating film is formed on said source wiring. It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would look to both of these embodiments and figures to find the claimed features.

More specifically, Embodiments 6, 7 and 8 in the present application describe examples, options, or modes of TFTs as shown in Figs. 14, 15 and 16, respectively. For example, Embodiment 6 and the corresponding Fig. 14 illustrate a single drain structure; Embodiment 7 and the corresponding Fig. 15 illustrate a reverse stagger type TFT; and Embodiment 8 and the corresponding Fig. 16 illustrate a bottom gate type TFT structure of the channel etch type. Each of these example TFTs has similarities, and one skilled in the art would understand that each of these example TFTs and the features therein could be applied to the other embodiments.

For example, the devices in each of these embodiments should have a source wiring and a gate electrode, wherein the source wiring is formed of the same material as the gate electrode. With regard to Fig. 16, “gate wiring” 1001 is a gate electrode and performs the function of a gate electrode. Further, a source region of a TFT in each embodiment should be connected to the source wiring.

In addition, with regard to Embodiment 8 and Fig. 16, it is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would understand that the TFT should have a source wiring like source wiring 904 formed of a same material as gate electrode 901 in Embodiment 7 and Fig. 15. It is further respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would understand that the source wiring 1006 in Fig. 16 is connected to additional source wiring formed of a same material as the gate wiring (electrode) 1001.

Therefore, there is a clear written description of the subject matter of independent Claims 91 and 92. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this response, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: April 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568